

26. The treating system according to claim 25 wherein the vapor-impervious film is one of polymethylpentene and polyvinyl chloride.--

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the application. New claims 23-26 are presented for consideration.

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as allegedly not being enabling. While the applicant disagrees, support has been added to each of the claims to address this rejection, the withdrawal of which is requested.

Claims 11, 12 and 18-20 are indicated to contain allowable subject matter. With the rejection under 35 USC §112 addressed and claims 11 and 18 rewritten in independent form, these claims, and claim 12, which depends from claim 11, and claims 19 and 20, which depend from claim 18, are believed in allowable form.

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,031,364 (Perkins). Claims 2 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Perkins. Claims 7-9 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Perkins in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,192,382 to Hamura et al (Hamura).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-22 is requested.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Perkins anticipates any claim pending in the application. Claim 1 is directed to wrapping a vapor-impervious film against and around the radially outwardly facing surface of a belt/belt sleeve body.

Perkins describes in column 3, lines 50-63, two distinct elements. The first is a "pressure wrap" which is wound around the completed belt in relatively narrow strip form in a helical manner to "envelop[e] the wound belt carcass B under pressure". A fair reading of this description is that the pressure wrap is intended to maintain the integrity of the belt carcass B.

The second element that Perkins discusses is "an airtight heat resistant bag or envelope for the belt", which apparently has a receptacle to receive the belt carcass. This latter structure would appear to fall within the language of being vapor-impervious.

However, it does not appear that the pressure wrap is intended to be vapor-impervious. Rather, the pressure wrap is apparently intended to maintain the integrity of the belt, rather than produce a vapor-impervious layer. This position is supported by the language in lines 62 and 63 in column 3 of Perkins wherein it is stated "this alternate method" which is referring to the use of a heat resistant bag, may be used in substitution for or in conjunction with the pressure wrap 20". The gist of this description apparently is that the pressure wrap is for integrity and the airtight, heat resistant bag or envelope is for sealing the belt carcass. The bag or envelope is described to be used alone or in conjunction with the pressure wrap. If the pressure wrap effected vapor-impervious

sealing, as suggested by the Examiner, the heat resistant bag or envelope would be superfluous.

The fact that the pressure wrap is described as being made from cotton or nylon does not, without more, suggest to one skilled in the art that it is vapor-impervious. The pressure wrap could certainly be porous and still perform its function of holding the belt elements together under pressure.

Accordingly, Perkins does not teach the method recited in claim 1. In fact, the description of using a heat resistant bag or envelope on the belt carcass suggests that the pressure wrap made from cotton or nylon is not sealed as contemplated by the invention.

Claims 2-13 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant details of the method to further distinguish over the prior art.

Apparatus claim 14 also includes the vapor-impervious film which is neither taught nor suggested by Perkins.

Claims 15-22 depend cognately from claim 14 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the prior art.

New claims 23-26 even further distinguish over the cited art. Claim 23 characterizes the sheet of vapor-impervious film as having a width that is greater than the axial length of the outwardly facing surface of the belt/belt sleeve. Perkins teaches a narrow wrap material that is substantially less in width than the axial extent of the belt carcass.

Claim 24 recites 2-4 layers of vapor-impervious film over the outwardly facing surface of the belt/belt sleeve body. In Perkins, there is no specific teaching as to the

number of layers, although there is discussion of wrapping and cross wrapping. However, there is no description that there are at least 2-4 layers over the entire surface.

Claims 25 and 26 more particularly characterize the nature of the film.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-22 and allowance of the case are requested.

The additional claim fee of \$150.00 is enclosed. Should additional fees be required in connection with this matter, please charge our deposit account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,



John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, VANSANTEN,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Dec 7, 1999